



Charnock, H. (2017). 'A Million Little Bonds': Infidelity, Divorce and the Emotional Worlds of Marriage in British Women's Magazines of the 1930s. *Cultural and Social History*, 14(3), 363-379.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14780038.2017.1314578>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1080/14780038.2017.1314578](https://doi.org/10.1080/14780038.2017.1314578)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Taylor and Francis at <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14780038.2017.1314578>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

Hannah Charnock

‘A million little bonds’: Infidelity, divorce and the emotional worlds of marriage in British women’s magazines of the 1930s

Throughout the 1930s, women’s magazines positioned themselves as an invaluable source of guidance for wives dealing with unfaithful spouses. In February 1936, *Woman’s Own* published an article entitled, ‘Make Friends with the “Other Woman”’, which offered practical help for women with philandering husbands.¹ The author initially reprimanded couples, diagnosing laziness and pride as the cause of broken marriages. However, they went on to prescribe a pragmatic course of action that was rooted in marital love’s supposedly enduring strength. Shifting to a maternal mode of address, the article’s author quickly exchanged stern admonishment for sage reassurance:

Remember, O doubting wife, that you start with a huge advantage over your rival. You and your husband are linked by a chain of happy memories, which she cannot share. [...] However blind his infatuation, that single fact has bound you more closely to him than ever she can be.

The article suggested that husbands may require subtle manipulation in order to recall their true attachment to the wives who ‘share [their] lives’, but it simultaneously reassured readers that ‘a real break [was] almost inconceivable’.

This advice is illustrative of women’s magazines’ particular understanding of married love at this time. Throughout the 1930s, the idea that marital love had its own enduring strength that could be called upon to rescue marriages from all manner of crises was a recurring theme in magazine discourse. Whatever mistakes had been made by either spouse (including laziness,

resentment and infidelity), the supposedly eternal strength of married love could be drawn upon to secure a couple's home and happiness. This was particularly prevalent within the magazines' discussions of infidelity. During this period, magazines such as *Woman's Own* insisted that the mutually-constructed emotional worlds created by couples within marriage were stronger than any affections evoked from outside. Their contributors deployed notions of romantic love and bonds of affection to fortify marriages threatened by infidelity because these feelings were understood to possess an insurmountable emotional power. Authors suggested that whilst such bonds required careful nurturing and maintenance, they were capable of withstanding challenges from without and within.

In recent years much excellent scholarship has explored the nature of marriage in the early twentieth century. Histories of feminism and the women's movement have examined the intersection of political activism and domestic life, whilst debates over legislation have been used by historians such as Gail Savage and Ann Sumner Holmes as a means of interrogating marital cultures of the past.² Historians have considered the ways in which expectations of marriage structured the lives of all women, whilst Selina Todd, Helen McCarthy and Kate Murphy have addressed the ways in which marriage shaped women's working lives across the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.³ The rise of media history encouraged numerous studies that explored the ways in which gender, sexuality and marriage were represented in the press and work by scholars such as Barbara Leckie, Lea Jacobs and Bill Overton has demonstrated the immense value of looking to the literature and film of past eras in pursuit of insights into historical marriage.⁴ At the same time, Katherine Holden, Tanya Evans and Patricia Thane, and Kathleen Kiernan have traced the experiences of women whose lives were defined by the marriages that they did not have.⁵

Interest in the history of emotions has offered many new insights into the ways in which changing emotional landscapes have affected the institution of marriage and

individuals' romantic and sexual relationships more broadly. Historians have interrogated the notion of 'companionate marriage', drawing upon changing wedding vows and oral history accounts of married life to suggest that former models of patriarchal marriage lost some of their hold in the period between 1918 and 1939.⁶ However, in arguing that the interwar period witnessed an intensification of adherence to the so-called 'companionate' model of conjugal relationships, which marked 'the beginning of a long trend towards a more heavily married society', historians have largely neglected questions of marital breakdown.⁷ Using magazine discourse to prop up their accounts of the rise of companionate marriage, existing scholarship has tended to cite magazines' insistence that their readers should recommit to adulterous marriages as evidence of early twentieth century society's 'unquestioning commitment to the preservation of marriage'.⁸ By simplifying infidelity discourse in this way and neglecting the altruistic conception of love at the centre of much magazine rhetoric of this time, historians have thus constructed reductionist narratives of interwar marriage and incomplete accounts of love's changing relationship with marriage and the self.

This is especially problematic in the wake of research by historians such as Claire Langhamer and Stephanie Cootz that has considered the so-called 'emotional revolution' of the mid- to late-twentieth century and argued that placing romantic love at its heart fundamentally destabilised the institution of marriage.⁹ They have demonstrated romantic love's increasing capacity to act as a destructive force in post-war marriage as individuals who failed to find fulfilment with their spouses terminated their marriages in the hope of finding it elsewhere. Offering a new perspective that charts the 'long' history of marriage across the last century, their work highlights the need to historicise the concept of love itself and demonstrates how notions of 'love' within marriage underwent a profound transition in the period following the Second World War.

In many ways, then, this article builds on the above model, expanding the frame to consider how conceptualisations of marriage in the 1930s fit within this narrative. It argues that, in contrast to accounts of the late-twentieth century in which notions of romantic love and emotional integrity were deployed to destabilise marriage, magazines of the interwar period suggested that love was forged within marriage itself and that it was the gradually earned and nurtured nature of marital love that gave it a potency that could not be destroyed by alternative lusts or relationships.¹⁰

This article suggests that we must understand magazine discourse of the 1930s as reflecting a particular moment within the history of marriage. Whilst social histories of Britain at this time are often framed by reference to the world wars, the most profound influence upon conceptualisations of infidelity and marriage at this time was not the conflict but the opportunities for divorce made possible by the Matrimonial Causes Act of 1923. Whilst divorce rates remained low, this change in divorce legislation represented shifting assumptions that marriage should be based upon mutual love and fidelity and altered understandings about how marriages should function. The new legislation made it possible for marriages to be formally terminated on the basis of fleeting infidelities and allowed the wives of unfaithful husbands to consider their marriages in new terms. In light of this, magazines constructed an image of infidelity designed to combat marriage's newfound fallibility. Rather than seeing this as an inherently reactionary attitude, however, we need to recognise their discourse as one which directly engaged with the 'new' marital ideals and their proposed responses to infidelity as an attempt to stave off companionate marriage's more self-destructive tendencies.

Beyond presenting a new understanding of marital discourse in this period, this article's exploration of interwar infidelity discourse disrupts narratives of 'the rise of companionate marriage' that have too readily associated 'emotions' with neoliberal

constructions of the individual self when accounting for love's changing relationship with marriage.¹¹ Whilst Langhamer's work has proved the fallibility of 'march of progress' accounts, histories of marriage continue to implicitly construct a triumphalist story in which the needs and desires of individuals became increasingly prioritised over the social institution of marriage. In this narrative, emotions are often assumed to be deeply individual experiences which may be mutually expressed but are not mutually constructed. Interwar discussions of infidelity challenge this model as they suggested that the emotional bonds forged within the shared experience of marriage could be used to reinforce marriages that were deemed to be in breakdown. Romantic emotions were not merely self-serving, but essential contributions to a shared marital endeavour, particularly when that project came under strain. Muddying the perceived binary between the individual and the institution of marriage, this research highlights how the latter could be bolstered, rather than simply challenged, by recourse to the emotional worlds of spouses. It suggests that the question historians must answer with regard to later developments is not, 'How did love become a threat to marriage?' but 'When and why did love cease performing its reinforcing role and become a servant of the self?'

This article takes divorce reform of 1923 as a starting point to explore how infidelity was constructed and understood in women's magazines such as *Woman's Own*, *Modern Woman* and *Modern Marriage*. Whilst the number of marriages that were officially terminated through divorce remained relatively low between the world wars, legal reforms facilitated conversations about infidelity and marital troubles in a way that had scarce been possible before. Moreover, although women's newfound ability to divorce unfaithful husbands was heralded as a triumph for gender equality, it nonetheless created a new form of anxiety regarding the material consequences of marital breakdown: should the raised expectations of marriage not be met, individuals now had a range of options available to them. Having initially explored how magazines' explicitly dealt with the issue of divorce, this article goes

on to examine how these publications articulated a model of marriage in which it was the bonds of affection and attraction forged within marriage that rendered such relationships strong enough to withstand the test of infidelity. Using infidelity discourse within magazines as a lens to observe conceptualisations of love within marriage more broadly, this work then demonstrates how, at a time in which social commentators perceived a collapse in social sanctions for separation and divorce, the concepts of love and emotional investment were mobilised to reinforce commitment to marriage in discussions of potential marital breakdown.

USING WOMEN'S MAGAZINES IN HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

This article considers the ways in which three British women's magazines addressed the matters of infidelity and divorce in the 1930s. These magazines (the weekly magazine *Woman's Own* and the monthly magazines *Modern Woman* and *Modern Marriage*), were primarily targeted at women in the middle- and respectable lower-classes. Readers were assumed to be married (or at least preparing for marriage) and the majority of the content was directed towards matters of housekeeping, marital relationships and child-rearing. As such, the magazines published long-form articles and advice columns alongside the classic magazine features of knitting patterns and romantic fiction. Seeking to differentiate themselves from existing publications aimed at older women, the imagery and content of these magazines were aimed at women in their twenties and thirties – pictured women were always young and glamorous whilst advice often assumed that women were in the early stages of marriage and that any children would be relatively young.¹²

Traditionally scholarship on women's magazines understood such publications as prime culprits of perpetuating women's oppression in so far as they 'situate[d] women (all

women) either firmly in the domestic sphere or in close proximity to it'.¹³ The genre has been critiqued for an unwavering focus on heterosexuality and domesticity that denied (or at least obfuscated) women's path to self-reliance and that maintained a 'reality' that extended no further than the family.¹⁴ Yet, as historians' attention has been drawn to consider and interrogate the realm of the emotions, the potential of magazines as sources for historical enquiry has been reconsidered. Far from unproblematically taking the emotional languages of this material at face value, historians have taken great care to conceptualise the relationships and interactions between authors, publishers, advertisers and readers.¹⁵ Magazines have been understood as having crafted an 'emotional culture' through which readers came to experience and express romantic love.¹⁶ Analysing the linguistic and visual vocabularies of women's magazines has allowed historians to move beyond a 'top-down reading of emotionology' to explore the dialogues and interplays that shaped these emotional cultures.¹⁷

Previous research into marriage in interwar Britain has made great use of marriage guidance manuals and court records as well as literary sources to examine shifting understandings of marriage. These didactic and institutional insights have been complemented by oral history research which offered unique perspectives into the everyday emotional worlds of ordinary people from across the class spectrum. In considering the marital discourses articulated in women's magazines, this article attends to a middle-ground between these approaches, highlighting the extent to which these publications attempted to reconcile contemporary ideals with individuals' complicated realities. This is not to say that the voices articulated within magazines such as *Woman's Own* were ever unmediated; content had to conform to strict editorial policy. As profit-making enterprises, the magazines' rhetoric could not be seen to damage commercial viability.¹⁸ As Joy Leman has described, production of magazines depended upon multiple layers of editors, advertising managers and company directors who had a particular ideology of women's role in society that was unlikely

to be challenged by the authors and contributors writing copy.¹⁹ However, the notion that the imperative for profit necessarily ensured dogmatism in message and form should be resisted.

Relying as they did upon repeat purchase in an increasingly saturated market, magazines could not afford to pursue a blinkered ideological agenda that entirely diverged from, or clashed with, the values and expectations of their potential readership. Whilst the focus on housework, marriage and motherhood was undoubtedly 'domestic', the meanings of this were by no means static.²⁰ Whilst *Woman's Own* was able to frame discussions about marriage in so far as editors chose what correspondence to print and which stories to feature, they were bound to the values of their audience. The magazines' authority as a source of advice was rooted in their ability to foster a relationship of intimacy and trust with their readers and this required a shared language and compromise. Magazines boasted of how many letters they received from readers and, as the correspondence to advice columnists makes clear, readers' personal experiences often ventured far from the companionate tropes and idealised models of marriage articulated in guidance books.²¹ The magazines were thus forced to engage with shifting social norms and the 'failure' of didactic ideals. Whilst their responses were often far from radical, women's magazines could not ignore the changing norms of interwar Britain. In Fiona Hackey's words: 'Feminine modernity, as it was materialized [...] in magazines, was a discourse attuned to the nuances and complexities of women's lives'.²²

This article examines magazine discourse on infidelity across a single decade in order to capture marital discourse at a specific moment in time. Doing so allows us to consider the rhetoric of magazines as being a product of both their genre and their temporal context.²³ As the next section argues, discussions of marital breakdown in the magazines of the 1930s not only reflected shifts in marital ideals and the new domestic consumerism but also marked a response to the changing social and legal status of divorce in the wake of the 1923

Matrimonial Causes Act and the debates preceding further divorce law reform in 1937. In the wake of these changes, women's magazines remained deeply invested in marriage as a social institution and personal relationship. However, in order to speak to their young audience with any authority, they had to respond to, rather than ignore or explicitly reject, women's newly-gained potential to divorce unfaithful husbands. Thus, by adopting a discourse of mutually-constituted emotional worlds, magazines embraced a language (if not an ideology) that was specifically 'modern'.

COMPANIONATE MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

A central, but often ignored, context of infidelity discourse in the 1920s and 1930s was the relatively new-found capacity of women to divorce their husbands on the grounds of adultery alone.²⁴ Under the Matrimonial Causes Act of 1857 a man could obtain divorce if his wife committed adultery, whilst women seeking to divorce their husbands had to prove not only adultery but an additional marital crime (usually physical cruelty). This double-standard made divorce very difficult for women to obtain, continuing the long established precedent that divorce was 'a remedy for aristocratic men who urgently needed legitimate heirs to carry on a family and inherit property'.²⁵ In the years immediately following the First World War, several attempts were made to reform the 1857 Act and changing attitudes towards marriage were reflected in discussions of divorce law. A 1919 editorial in the *Manchester Guardian*, for example, praised the new Danish Marriage and Divorce Bill that sought to make marriage 'a full partnership [...] requiring from both the same measure of loyalty'.²⁶ Similarly, the *Daily Herald* praised the House of Lords in 1920 for 'defeat[ing] the mediævalists' in passing Lord Buckmaster's Divorce Bill in its Third Reading.²⁷

In 1923 the Liberal backbenchers Major C. F. Entwistle and Isaac Foot put forward a Bill to enable women to acquire divorce on the grounds of adultery alone, a move lauded by commentators who described how ‘Chivalry, logic and justice are alike offended by the implied suggestion of the present law that faithfulness is less admirable in a man than in a woman’.²⁸ Whilst records of the House of Commons debates demonstrate fierce resistance to the Bill on the part of a handful of MPs, it passed by a resounding majority. The Bill’s proponents heralded the reform not only as a triumph for gender equality but as a necessary step in making marital law better reflect contemporary values and expectations of marriage. As John Frederick Peel Rawlinson, the Conservative MP for Cambridge University, summarised, ‘the view that the contract of marriage is an indissoluble contract, that you take a woman for better or worse and that she takes you until death parts you both’ was ‘not so much [held] in the present generation’.²⁹ Whilst, in his view, the law should resist the understanding that marriage was ‘a mere matter of personal contract’ that could be ended at will, others believed that the law had an obligation to embrace changing attitudes. Introducing the Bill’s Second Reading, Entwistle described it ‘as an attempt to remove an anachronism’ as ‘the days have gone by when a wife could be regarded as her husband’s chattel’.³⁰

Although the number of divorces remained low (even after further divorce law reform, only 7535 marriages were formally ended in 1938), divorce was a popular topic of discussion and drama in the interwar period, reflecting and perpetuating a new form of anxiety surrounding marital breakdown.³¹ Politicians and social commentators of this time were particularly concerned about the visibility of ‘deviant’ sexualities and their perceived potential to corrupt the public: in 1921, the House of Lords defeated an Amendment to the Criminal Law Amendment Act to make ‘acts of gross indecency’ between women illegal on the basis that, ‘the more you advertise vice by prohibiting it the more you will increase it’.³²

Divorce law reform stirred similar concerns, particularly in relation to the press' extensive coverage of divorce trials. The practice of gratuitously reporting on divorce trials – all of which had sexual infidelity at their core – had been established in the nineteenth century and was only enhanced in the early decades of the twentieth century by the influx of popular daily papers and the establishment of the picture press. Whilst there was an argument to be made that this practice served as a deterrent to divorce (in Barbara Leckie's words, 'the courtroom and the newspaper made it not just legitimate, but also mandatory, to subject the most intimate details of one's private and sexual life to a comprehensive surveillance'), some individuals, including King George V, were concerned that the ubiquity of such coverage was desensitising the British public to sexual deviance and represented an implicit acceptance of such behaviour.³³ The belief that such journalism had a 'very deteriorating effect on public morals and cause[d] an infinity of harm', underpinned the 1926 Judicial Proceedings (Regulation of Reports) Bill, which restricted newspapers to printing only the most basic details of divorce trials.³⁴ In light of a spike in divorce numbers after the end of the war, as well as divorce law reform, there was a growing feeling that the permanent nature of marriage was being eroded and that the visibility of marital breakdown would only cause this trend to accelerate.

Whilst the Judicial Proceedings Act and cinema censorship marked deliberate attempts to shield infidelity and divorce from public view, carefully framed infidelity discourse emerged elsewhere, including in magazines such as *Woman's Own*, *Modern Woman* and *Modern Marriage*.³⁵ Here, women were invited to discuss and reveal the challenges they faced in their marriages. This forum, far from undermining the institution of marriage, was presented as being vital to its survival. These publications of the 1920s and 1930s perpetuated the assumption that it was the aspiration of the majority of their readers to find and hold on to romantic love and marriage; their content implied (if not stated outright)

that domestic married life and motherhood was the ideal for which all women should strive. However, their success was also dependent upon addressing challenges of 'real' life with a tone of 'intimacy and confidentiality'.³⁶ As such, the magazines regularly published features on marital troubles (including a series in *Woman's Own* entitled 'Snags in Marriage') and printed responses to wronged readers who had been compelled to write to them. The very fact that readers faced with infidelity felt that they had a degree of choice in terms of how they should proceed is testament to the destabilising power of changing marital discourses. The magazine's rhetoric regarding infidelity had at once to acknowledge the new social reality of women's potential to get divorced, but still maintain the presumption that other readers had high hopes for long-lasting love and marriage.

For the most part, women's magazines avoided directly addressing the issue of divorce, however, in only its second edition *Woman's Own* drew attention to the matter as part of a series entitled, 'I wish I hadn't –'.³⁷ This article set the template for the majority of the magazine's future dealings with the topic as the author lamented how, 'while my little world was still shaking under my feet, [I] tried to build my future and I made a mess of it. Friends and relatives got on their hind legs and said it could not be tolerated – divorce was the only thing'. The magazine thus established early in its existence that its marital advice stood apart from contemporary public opinion which it suggested uniformly advocated divorce in light of adultery. Whilst historians have previously dismissed the magazine's advice that 'wronged' women should forgive their husbands' affairs as being somewhat regressive, such publications perceived their advice to be radical in the contemporary climate.³⁸ They positioned themselves not as pushing a controversially 'traditional' agenda that insisted upon the permanent nature of marital vows, but as embracing modern marital ideals founded upon mutual emotional investment. In this way, their approach can be better

understood as a form of what Alison Light has referred to as ‘conservative modernism’: magazines retained some traditional values whilst actively engaging with and articulating ‘new’ conceptualisations of ideal marriage.³⁹ In particular, the magazines eschewed divorce as a response to infidelity but did so upon the grounds that the rejection of the love wives still had for their spouse (however unfaithful) was far more psychologically damaging than the temporary emotions of shame and hurt that the discovery of an affair might provoke.

This attitude was captured in a 1934 article by Claude F. Luke entitled ‘Dragooned into Divorce’.⁴⁰ The inability of divorce to provide emotional relief or satisfaction was stated in the closing line of the article’s opening paragraph: ‘The divorce, of which they hoped so much, has solved none of their problems’.⁴¹ Instead, ‘[The couple] find, now it is too late, that they still love each other; that divorce was the very last thing either of them desired; and that the freedom upon which their friends harped so blithely is infinitely less satisfactory than the oft-abused “bonds” of matrimony’. Luke presented divorce as ‘a dismal conclusion’ and ‘a miserable tragedy’. He condemned the apparent abundance of spouses whose preoccupation with ‘public opinion, convention, a mistaken sense of honour, and that common dread of “what people will say”’, led them to get divorced on the basis of a single count of adultery. Arguing that ‘from our earliest consciousness we have been taught automatically to link infidelity with divorce’, the article suggested that contemporary society not only condoned divorce as a response to adultery, but that it encouraged wronged spouses to formally dissolve their marriages. Starkly contrasting the late-twentieth century view that the capacity to divorce was liberating, this narrative presented the opposite view; in this discussion divorcing parties were portrayed as victims of a pernicious system in which the feelings and concerns of individuals were of little importance compared to societal expectations. Whilst Luke’s article conceded that adultery represented a transgression of marital vows which could deeply wound the other spouse, it suggested that the emotional

bonds formed in marriage transcended such a breach. Far from suggesting that the institution of marriage must be upheld at all costs, magazines mobilised the emotive rhetoric of companionate marriage to suggest that individuals' emotional integrity was more firmly ingrained in their marriages than they may first seem. It was implied that the pain felt upon the discovery of infidelity was not a reason to end a marriage but proof of the participants' need for it to survive.

EMOTIONAL BONDS IN THE FIGHT AGAINST MARITAL BREAKDOWN

Magazine discourse on infidelity extended far beyond discussions of divorce, however, as they frequently printed feature articles, short stories and advice column segments on the topic of unfaithfulness more generally. Although the format of discussion was varied, the central portrayal of infidelity was not: whilst histories of post-war marriage have tended to examine the centrality of female adultery within magazine discourse, interwar magazines focussed primarily upon narratives of husbands' infidelity.⁴² These magazines did publish correspondence from women who had been unfaithful to their spouses but the most common trope of infidelity was that of the married man who became bored of his wife and turned to younger women for entertainment. Unlike legal definitions of adultery which rested solely upon penetrative sexual intercourse, the magazines' understandings of what constituted a breach of marital fidelity were far more elastic and encompassed a much broader range of acts. Being married to a 'philanderer' was uniformly lamented, though what exactly constituted philandering was open to question.⁴³

Discussions of infidelity in the magazines were devoid of direct sexual references; instead, infidelity was signalled through reference to 'infatuation'⁴⁴, 'becoming attached'⁴⁵, and falling in love.⁴⁶ The threat of infidelity was often implied through concerns regarding

men's propensity to flirt: 'there is a type of man whose every action, every look is a flirtation'.⁴⁷ Moreover, although most of the discussions of infidelity centred on extra-marital relationships, the fact that women wrote to complain of husbands who, 'whenever we see a pretty girl in the street, or even in a picture, [...] looks at her with such longing', demonstrates that not only physical interactions but attraction and desire at a distance were also taken to represent a violation of marital fidelity.⁴⁸ Crucially, the magazines accepted and engaged with these laments from readers, never questioning their veracity as 'true' infidelity or doubting that they were violations; flirtations and lustful glances were understood as being unacceptable transgressions of marital vows of fidelity.⁴⁹

By incorporating such a broad range of behaviours into the rubric of infidelity, the magazines of the 1930s thus positioned contented marriage as requiring more than mere sexual monogamy. Whilst historians have used *Woman's Own* to posit that adultery became increasingly detrimental to marriage between 1940 and 1970, evidence explored here suggests that in the 1930s marriage was already understood as a site of intense emotional investment and infidelity already represented a form of marital crisis.⁵⁰ However, far from being a mere precursor to the 'emotional revolution' of the mid-century in which the emotional and psychological needs of the individual were used to promote, and subsequently undermined, the institution of marriage, the infidelity discourse articulated within interwar women's magazines represents an alternative mobilisation of this emotional language.

Magazine commentators discussed the behaviours and psychologies of individual spouses, yet at the core of their narratives was an understanding of *shared* emotional worlds. The magazines suggested that whilst feelings of despair and betrayal were natural and understandable, they were fleeting and insignificant when compared to the emotional bonds that wives had forged with their spouse over the duration of their courtship and marriage. Magazine commentators and correspondents positioned infidelity as a slight against, but

rarely a barrier to or destroyer of, the love between a married couple. In these narratives, discovering infidelity never led women to fall out of love with their husbands. Instead, in their imaginary, infidelity forced women to recognise and articulate the depth of love they had for their spouses. Josephine wrote to the advice column at *Modern Marriage* for help dealing with her husband who ‘simply [couldn’t] resist girls’ but was constantly disappointed by them. The opening line of the reply read: ‘I am dreadfully sorry for you, because I think it is harder to see the man one loves behaving in a futile way, than even having a really serious affair’.⁵¹ Despite the husband’s numerous affairs, the advice columnist did not question that this woman remained deeply emotionally invested in her marriage. Elsewhere, wronged wives were told, ‘you love him, and it’s worth giving him what he wants if it means the safety of your home,’⁵² and, ‘it’s worth acting a bit when it’s the man you love who is the object of the fight’.⁵³ Though their husbands’ behaviour transgressed the perceived boundaries of marital fidelity, their misdeeds only made wives more aware of their marital bonds. Far from diminishing emotional investment and connection, a husband’s misbehaviour rendered visible the intensity of their spouses’ feelings towards them.

This sense that men may stray but would always return was bolstered by the recurring metaphor of marital bonds. Magazines repeatedly suggested that marriage could be understood as a series of ties. These links weren’t simply legal but were couched in emotional terms. One commentator described the ‘multitude of little ties’ that held people together in marriage and assured readers that, with time, straying husbands would come to see ‘the proved worth of [his wife] with whom he has lived for years’.⁵⁴ While another suggested that, ‘There is hardly likely to be any danger that anything serious will come of this infatuation, because your husband is far too deeply involved in his marriage [...] to make the game worth the candle’.⁵⁵ The magazines thus suggested that love was a deeply felt connection between spouses that could not be undone or overthrown by men’s fleeting dalliances with other

women. Whilst men's behaviour contravened the sanctity of the legally and religiously recognised wedding vows, their infidelity was not caused by, nor did it elicit, men falling out of love with their wives; within these narratives, what men did was not a fair representation of what they felt.

This dissonance between men's actions and their feelings was constructed through the frequent use of immaturity metaphors to describe husbands' indiscretions. Affairs were ascribed to the fact that, 'There is a little boy in all men who loves to be sympathised with'.⁵⁶ Leonora Eyles, a prolific commentator on contemporary marriage and the resident advice columnist at *Woman's Own*, suggested that 'most [unfaithful men] are children,' who 'come back home after a time looking like little boys who have been at the jam cupboard and are expecting a spanking'.⁵⁷ Eyles expressed a similar sentiment in an advice column published in the same magazine several years earlier: 'Your husband is young and thoughtless; it is up to you to be his playmate as well as his housekeeper'.⁵⁸ At other times, men's tendency for adultery was presented as an unfortunate affliction as contributors compared men's infidelity to children's diseases and ailments. One contemporary explained how, 'Men get these attacks, like kiddies get the measles,' whilst another noted how men 'outgrow this habit, as children outgrow teething troubles'.⁵⁹ In contrast to traditional notions of rational and controlled masculinity which underpinned models of patriarchal marriage, Eyles infantilised the philandering husbands of interwar Britain, portraying them as naïve children. The temptation that men fell prey to was not erotic, lustful or meaningful but was instead playful, aesthetic and, crucially, short-lived.

Within this model, then, men's affairs marked a transgression of marital fidelity but did not compromise marital love. Any emotional investment with their mistress was presented as being additional to, rather than replacing, the love they were deemed to have for their spouse: the sentiment 'I am convinced that your husband loves you,' in spite of his

infidelity was widely expressed.⁶⁰ Infidelity was instead attributed to the fact that men were easily distracted and emphasis was placed on the fleetingness of husbands' interest in other women: although it was unfortunate that some men preferred 'the thrill of a glittering glass bobble to the steady glow of real gold,' eventually 'they wake up and find that the glass bobble has splintered to nothing and the gold is still left'.⁶¹ Infidelity was presented as a 'diversion', the result of 'a foolish impulse' and readers were reassured that, 'Usually, if a man has one of those kissing-and-cuddling affairs after his marriage it is very soon over'.⁶² In this way, infidelity was understood as a weak challenger to the deep-rooted emotional bonds of marriage. Although, as the final section will demonstrate, advice columnists and journalists were not necessarily kind to correspondents dealing with infidelity, their insistence upon the capacity of marriages to overcome unfaithfulness was articulated not through emphasis upon marriage as a social contract but instead relied upon modern conceptualisations of marriage as an emotional investment.

MARITAL LOVE, EMOTIONAL LABOUR AND DOMESTICITY

This discourse of marital bonds implicitly relied upon the notion that such emotional attachments were, in part, the product of a shared past and time spent together. The opening lines of correspondence printed in the magazines often stated how long couples had been married and divorce narratives often highlighted the tragedy of ending long-term marriages: one woman ruefully repeated her husband's plea, 'We can't smash up all the past'.⁶³ However, whilst this model of marriage and infidelity assumed a degree of emotional bonding over time, the magazines also stressed the need for these bonds to be conscientiously nurtured. In the words of one commentator: 'Married people must try constantly to please each other'.⁶⁴ In this way, infidelity was understood not as a challenge to, but a test of, a

couple's emotional investment in marriage and their response to it revealed the degree of commitment they had to appropriate levels of emotional labour. Readers were informed that: 'The wife should accept the husband's transgressions as a challenge. She should expend her energies, not in heaping reproaches on her husband's head [...] but in trying to re-establish the marriage on its former basis of love and happiness'.⁶⁵ Whilst magazine discourse very clearly articulated the view that 'modern' marriage with all its emphasis on emotional commitment and investment was a source of immense happiness and contentment, it simultaneously acknowledged that this was not easy and often required careful management. The magazines' advice to women represented not a rejection of romance-based marriage, nor a wholesale embracing of individuals' psychological and emotional worlds, but an alternative position in which individuals needed to carefully manage their emotional impulses and behaviours in order to secure their marriages, and in turn, their long-term happiness.

As such, magazines explicitly differentiated between the passing emotions of a husband's infatuation and a wife's anger and hurt at discovering infidelity, and the deep-rooted, supposedly permanent emotional bond that spouses shared. A key facet of their strategy was to emphasise that women wanting to win back their husband's attention and fidelity needed to eschew dramatic hyper-emotional responses and instead employ cool rationality. In the first instalment of the 'Snags in Marriage' series, Leonora Eyles acknowledged that discovering a husband's affair 'hurts' but insisted that the way to get through it was to not 'take it too seriously' but to act 'wisely and sanely'. Eyles explicitly warned women against getting 'weepy and angry', 'pathetic or ridiculous', suggesting instead that they should 'go out and get cheered up' and 'Be normal and cheerful'.⁶⁶ Readers were sharply informed that, 'No woman need lose her man if she will not get mentally lazy or peevish' and were once again reminded that 'there are between a husband and wife a million little bonds' that hold them 'in the sweetest and happiest safety'.

This hierarchy of emotion was most visible in articles that sought to deal with ‘the other woman’. One reader featured in the magazine used an article to share the ‘plan’ she had used to win back her husband in light of his infidelity.⁶⁷ She told of how she had explicitly avoided ‘flustering up in a rage’, employing instead a tactical ‘plot’ to be nice to the other woman. She emphasized the need for ‘strong nerves and pluck’, but in the end it was all worth it as her husband ‘realized at long last that his wife was his real mate, and I had the satisfaction of forgiving him’. A similar sentiment was expressed in a later article which decried how ‘Most women do a stupid thing. They storm or sulk, [... and] they abuse the other woman’.⁶⁸ In so doing, this piece argued, wives ‘show the most unattractive side of their character, and probably shatter any hope of reconciliation’. Within such articles, wives’ immediate emotional reactions were deemed valid but they were also to be swiftly discarded in order for women to realise their true desire to fix their broken marriages.

Offering not simply reactive, but pre-emptive advice to wives, these magazines often positioned infidelity as a symptom of more profound marital problems caused by emotional neglect. Whilst emotional domesticity and images of home and hearth have often accompanied narratives of the rise of companionate marriage, infidelity discourse within *Woman’s Own* and other women’s magazines explicitly positioned domestic life as a potential impediment to marital happiness.⁶⁹ Both husbands and wives were accused of too readily settling into domestic drudgery and neglecting to nurture their relationship: ‘I have often heard husbands complain that married life is so dull. The truth is, though they would not admit it, that they themselves are dull, because they have allowed themselves to become so, sinking into the rut of domesticity with scarcely an effort to extricate themselves’.⁷⁰ The magazines also insisted that women carefully negotiate the domestic landscape as without thoughtful navigation, wives had the potential to become ‘dull and stupid, talking too much about saucepans and teething powders’.⁷¹ When one young woman wrote to *Woman’s Own*

asking for advice regarding her straying husband, Leonora Eyles frankly stated that, ‘much of this trouble is your own fault. You have let yourself get dowdy and obsessed with your babies. I know it is hard to leave tiny babies but you could manage it if you tried’.⁷² In discussions of infidelity at least, the roles of ‘mother’ and ‘housewife’ were portrayed not as component parts of the wife role but were instead distinct identities which distracted from the emotional connection at the heart of marriage.

At the same time that magazines were emphasising the significance of emotional bonds that could only have developed over time, they suggested other transformations of marital ‘aging’ should be resisted. Whilst time created emotional links, couples needed to avoid becoming lazy or complacent in their closeness.⁷³ Readers were warned that ‘Marriage is not just a safe, comfortable relationship into which to retire, taking no further trouble.’⁷⁴ Practical advice encouraged women to remember and restore the emotional effort and joy that characterised the early days of their relationship and marriage: rather than trading ‘early’ love for ‘married’ love, it was suggested that women should continue to enact the former in order to strengthen the latter. *Modern Woman* suggested that, faced with choosing between his mistress and his wife, a man would ‘remember [his wife] as a shy bride [...] and renounce, almost with relief, this passing passion’.⁷⁵ Whilst women were engaging with the magazine as wives, the magazines suggested that ‘the sensible woman manages that her husband sees her always as his sweetheart rather than prosaically as the woman he has married’.⁷⁶ The magazines rejected that age itself was a factor, but implied that over time wives were apt to drift into domesticity and neglect the small actions and behaviours that fostered and expressed love and affection.

This stance was neatly established in the very first edition of *Woman’s Own* which featured a short story entitled ‘House Proud’ in which a wife very nearly ‘lost’ her husband because she was ‘always busy, always at work’: ‘If only she would spare a few moments to

sit on his knees; if only she would let him fondle her hair as he used to do when they were first engaged'.⁷⁷ That her business involved 'knitting or mending [...] bending over the gas stove, getting things nice for him' mattered little as her husband felt that his emotional needs were being neglected. In the very same issue of the magazine an article entitled, 'Looks Do Count After Marriage, Even More Than Before!', sternly stated: 'I will not listen to the little housewife who tells me she is so busy looking after the house that she has not time to "bother with herself"'.⁷⁸ The magazine insisted that women must nurture attraction as well as affection because 'more men are held in loving bondage by a woman's good looks than by her good works'.⁷⁹ As such, when men had been unfaithful, women were advised to make an effort to look their best and to 'get some new clothes – yes, even if you can't afford them'.⁸⁰ In order to secure their homes and happiness, women had to carefully manage their domestic behaviours and ensure that they were directing their effort and care towards their husbands and not just their homes.

The magazines took the stance that the brunt of emotional labour should be borne by women. This imbalance wasn't passively accepted, however. As the above quote regarding men slipping into the 'rut of domesticity' demonstrates, commentators could be critical of men's role in marital breakdown. Moreover, the magazines were occasionally self-critical, pointing out the extent to which they perpetuated the notion that affective labour was the wife's responsibility: 'It is an amazing fact,' wrote Jane Custer in 1926, 'that we rarely, if ever, see articles headed "How to Keep Your Wife's Love" or "How to Avoid Boring Your Wife"'.⁸¹ Such sentiments could be incorporated within discussions of infidelity and marital breakdown precisely because notions of emotional *mutuality* were so central to the magazines' construction of marriage. Although women were undoubtedly expected to invest time and energy into their marriages, it was understood that such work would be rewarded with shared emotional fulfilment. Unlike the late-twentieth century, post-'emotional

revolution' era, in which emotions were understood to be deeply rooted in the psychology of the individual and increasingly associated with neo-liberal constructions of selfhood, in the interwar period marriage represented the union of two individuals' emotional worlds.⁸² Encouraging women to recommit to their marriages in the wake of infidelity, represented an understanding that individuals were not merely contractually bound to their spouses, but affectively tied to them as well. This discourse that encouraged wives to 'remember always that the greatest bond between you [and your husband] is your friendship – your understanding of each other' represents a model of companionate marriage in which affection, attraction and friendship had to be carefully nurtured but had the capacity withstand infidelity because the shared emotional world constructed within marriage was deemed stronger than any affections evoked from outside of it.⁸³

CONCLUSION

Magazine discourse on infidelity in the 1930s was thus a product of a unique social context in which the new-found potential for divorce created new possibilities and responsibilities for married couples and, in particular, wives with unfaithful husbands. Whilst the reality remained that few of the magazines' readers would or could ever actually divorce their adulterous spouses, the 1923 Matrimonial Causes Act allowed magazines to imagine that infidelity could result in divorce. As the rest of their content continued to cater to the view that long-lasting, love-based marriage was the universal aspiration of women, the magazines expanded their vocabulary of emotional commitment to cover and defend marriages challenged by unfaithfulness.

In this way, the magazines' discourse embodies a form of what Alison Light has referred to as 'conservative modernism': whilst the publications' motives were inherently

conservative in so far as they sought to defend the institution of marriage, they did so by mobilising decidedly modern conceptualisations of marriage which placed romantic love and mutual commitment at its heart.⁸⁴ Exploring discussions of infidelity allows us to observe the elastic nature of definitions of love and fidelity and the markers by which they were measured. Whilst MPs debating divorce law reform in the early 1920s focussed primarily upon the material outcomes of adultery (namely illegitimate children and the transmission of venereal disease), the narratives presented in women's magazines in the 1930s were concerned with the transgressions of flirting, dancing and companionship.⁸⁵ Far from being trivial, these acts were deemed to profoundly disrupt the marital relationship. Crucially, however, the magazines suggested that such violations of marital fidelity could never fully breach or destroy the bonds forged in marriage. Whilst they acknowledged that spouses could feel differently, they fundamentally asserted that spouses' emotional integrity rested not in their individual selves, but in the shared and mutually constructed bonds of marital love. Such was the strength of these bonds that they could resist challenges from without and within.

Unpicking the infidelity narratives of the interwar period thus complicates notions of companionate marriage by suggesting that the fundamental change that occurred in the twentieth century was not merely an increasing association of marriage with love, but the shifting function of love within the marital relationship. Magazine discourse on infidelity in the 1930s reveals that emotional investment was an assumed aspect of marriage even before the Second World War. 'Love' was synonymous with happiness and its power lay in its mutually forged and managed nature. Within women's magazines the boundaries between individual and shared emotional worlds were blurred as it was suggested that mutual emotional investment was the foundation of marriage and could be relied upon to strengthen marriages that were deemed to be in breakdown. This stands in stark contrast to other historians' characterisations of marriage in the late-twentieth century in which individuals

hoped that marriage would be a site of emotional fulfilment but were prepared to leave it if it failed to live up to those expectations. It thus appears that the key difference between models of marriage articulated in the 1930s and those of the 1970s is not the existence of, or value placed upon, love, but the role it is deemed to be playing; whilst in the former it was the end in itself, in the latter it was simply one facet of the all-consuming project of selfhood. What remains to be explored are the questions of how and why, at least in terms of marriage, the privileging of interpersonal emotional worlds was replaced by a conceptualisation of emotion that elevated the needs and experiences of the individual.

¹ *Woman's Own*, 1 Feb. 1936, p. 641.

² Martin Pugh, 'Women and the Women's Movement in Britain, 1914-1999', 2nd ed. (Basingstoke, 2000); Catriona Beaumont, *Housewives and Citizens: Domesticity and the Women's Movement in England, 1928-64* (Manchester, 2013). Gail Savage, 'They Would if They Could: Class, Gender, and Popular Representations of English Divorce Litigation, 1858-1908', *Journal of Family History*, 36 (2011), pp. 173-190; Lucy Bland, 'The Trials and Tribulations of Edith Thompson: The Capital Crime of Sexual Incitement in 1920s England', *Journal of British Studies*, 47 (2008), pp. 624-648; Ann Summer Holmes, 'The Double Standard in the English Divorce Laws, 1857-1923', *Law and Social Inquiry*, 20 (1995), pp. 605-620.

³ Selina Todd, *Young Woman, Work, and Family in England 1918-1950* (Oxford, 2005); Helen McCarthy, 'Women, Marriage and Work in the British Diplomatic Service', *Women's History Review*, 23 (2014), pp. 853-873; Kate Murphy, 'A Marriage Bar of Convenience? The BBC and Married Women's Work 1923-39', *Twentieth Century British History*, 25 (2014), pp. 533-561.

⁴ Peter N. Stearns and Mark Knapp, 'Men and Romantic Love: Pinpointing a 20th-Century Change', *Journal of Social History*, 26 (1993), pp. 769-795; Gail Savage, 'Erotic Stories and Public Decency: Newspaper Reporting of Divorce Proceedings in England', *The Historical Journal*, 41 (1998), pp. 511-528; Adrian Bingham, *Gender, Modernity and the Press in Interwar Britain* (Oxford, 2004); Lucy Bland, "'Hunnish Scenes' and a 'Virgin Birth': a 1920s Case of Sexual and Bodily Ignorance", *History Workshop Journal*, 73 (2012), pp. 118-143. Barbara Leckie, *Culture and Adultery: The Novel, the Newspaper and the Law, 1857-1914* (Philadelphia, 1999); Lea Jacobs, *The Wages of Sin: Censorship and the Fallen Woman Film, 1928-1942* (London, 1995); Bill

Overton, *The Novel of Female Adultery: Love and Gender in Continental European Fiction, 1830-1900*

(Basingstoke, 1996).

⁵ Katherine Holden, *The Shadow of Marriage: Singleness in England 1914-1960* (Manchester, 2007); Tanya Evans and Patricia Thane, *Sinners? Scroungers? Saints? Unmarried Motherhood in Twentieth-Century England* (Oxford, 2012); Kathleen Kiernan et al., *Lone Mothers in Twentieth Century Britain: From Footnote to Front Page* (Oxford, 1998).

⁶ Timothy Willem Jones, 'Love, Honour and Obedience? Romance, Subordination and Marital Subjectivity in Interwar Britain' in Timothy Willem Jones and Alana Harris (eds), *Love and Romance in Britain 1918-1970* (Basingstoke, 2014); Elizabeth Roberts, *A Woman's Place: An Oral History of Working-Class Women, 1890-1940* (Oxford, 1984); Simon Szreter and Kate Fisher, *Sex Before the Sexual Revolution: Intimate Life in England 1918-1963* (Oxford, 2010); Margaret Lane, 'Not the Boss of One Another: A Reinterpretation of Working-Class Marriage in England, 1900 to 1970', *Cultural and Social History*, 11 (2014), pp. 441-458.

⁷ Martin Pugh, *We Danced All Night: A Social History of Britain Between the Wars* (London, 2009), p. 127. An exception on marital breakdown is: A. James Hammerton, *Cruelty and Companionship: Conflict in Nineteenth-Century Married Life* (London, 1992).

⁸ Claire Langhamer, 'Adultery in Post-war England', *History Workshop Journal*, 62 (2006), p. 103. See also Roy Porter and Leslie Hall, *The Facts of Life: The Creation of Sexual Knowledge in Britain, 1650-1950* (New Haven and London, 1995), p. 265.

⁹ Claire Langhamer, *The English in Love: The Intimate Story of an Emotional Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); Stephanie Cootz, *Marriage, a History: How Love Conquered Marriage* (New York: Penguin Books, 2006).

¹⁰ Langhamer, *The English in Love*.

¹¹ Anthony Giddens, *The Transformation of Intimacy: Sexuality, Love and Eroticism in Modern Societies* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997).

¹² Jill Greenfield and Chris Reid, 'Women's Magazines and the Commercial Orchestration of Femininity in the 1930s: Evidence from Woman's Own', *Media History* 4 (1998), p. 164.

¹³ Ros Ballaster, Margaret Beetham, Elizabeth Frazer and Sandra Hebron, *Women's Worlds: Ideology, Femininity and the Women's Magazine* (Basingstoke, 1991), p. 13.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

-
- ¹⁵ Claire Langhamer, 'Everyday Advice on Everyday Love: Romantic Expertise in Mid-Twentieth Century Britain', *L'HOMME, European Journal of Feminist History* 24 (2013), pp. 35-52. Penny Morris, 'From Private to Public: Alba de Céspedes' Agony Column in 1950s Italy', *Modern Italy* 9 (2004), pp. 11-20.
- ¹⁶ Francesca M. Cancian and Steven L. Gordon, 'Changing Emotion Norms in Marriage: Love and Anger in U.S. Women's Magazines Since 1900', *Gender and Society* 2 (1988), p. 313.
- ¹⁷ Langhamer, 'Everyday Advice', p. 38.
- ¹⁸ For a detailed discussion of the business of magazines see Howard Cox and Simon Mowatt, *Revolutions from Grub Street: A History of Magazine Publishing in Britain* (Oxford, 2014).
- ¹⁹ Joy Leman, "'The Advice of a Real Friend': Codes of Intimacy and Oppression in Women's Magazines 1937-1955", *Women's Studies International Quarterly* 3 (1980), p.66.
- ²⁰ The relationship between domesticity and modernity is explored in Judy Giles, *The Parlour and the Suburb: Domestic Identities, Class, Femininity and Modernity* (Oxford, 2004).
- ²¹ In its June 1932 issue *Modern Woman* boasted that it received over 300 letters a week.
- ²² Fiona Hackney, "'Women are News': British Women's Magazines 1919-1939" in Ann L. Ardis and Patrick Collier (eds), *Transatlantic Print Culture, 1880-1940: Emerging Media, Emerging Modernisms* (Basingstoke, 2008), pp. 114-33.
- ²³ Penny Tinkler has called for a more nuanced understanding of individual publications' genre and form: Penny Tinkler, *Constructing Girlhood: Popular Magazines for Girls Growing Up in England 1920-1950* (London, 1995), p. 2.
- ²⁴ An exception to this is Tanya Evans, 'The Other Woman and her Child: Extra-marital affairs and illegitimacy in Twentieth-Century Britain', *Women's History Review* 20 (2011), pp. 47-65.
- ²⁵ Savage, 'They Would if they Could'.
- ²⁶ *Manchester Guardian*, 9 May 1919, p. 6.
- ²⁷ *Daily Herald*, 23 June 1920, p. 5.
- ²⁸ *Manchester Guardian*, 3 March 1923, p. 10.
- ²⁹ Hansard HC Debate, 2 March 1923, Col. 2383.
- ³⁰ Hansard HC Debate, 2 Mar. 1923 Col. 2356-7.
- ³¹ Leslie A. Hall, *Sex, Gender and Social Change in Britain since 1880* (Basingstoke and London, 2000), p. 130.
- ³² Hansard HL Debate, 15 Aug. 1921 Col. 570.

³³ Leckie, *Culture and Adultery*, p. 110. Infidelity narratives were a staple of popular fiction in this period, see for example the works of D.H. Lawrence, James Joyce, Evelyn Waugh, Daphne Du Maurier and F. Tennyson Jesse.

³⁴ Hansard HC Debate, 15 May 1923, vol. 165, col. 249. For more detail on the Act see: Gail Savage, 'Erotic Stories and Public Decency: Newspaper Reporting of Divorce Proceedings in England', *The Historical Journal* 41 (1998), pp. 511-528; Adrian Bingham, *Family Newspapers? Sex, Private Life, and the British Popular Press 1918-1978* (Oxford, 2009), pp. 133-144.

³⁵ Although the divorce comedy was an increasingly popular Hollywood import, 'scenes of suggestive immorality', 'illicit relationships' and 'situations accentuating delicate marital relations' were among the British Board of Film Certification's grounds for film deletion.

³⁶ Leman, 'Codes of Intimacy and Oppression', p. 63.

³⁷ *Woman's Own*, 22 Oct. 1932, p. 51, 77.

³⁸ Martin Pugh, *Women and the Women's Movement in Britain, 1914-1999*, 2nd ed. (Basingstoke, 2000), pp. 213-4.

³⁹ Alison Light, *Forever England: Femininity, Literature and Conservatism between the Wars* (London, 1991), p. 11.

⁴⁰ *Woman's Own*, 24 Feb. 1934, p. 584.

⁴¹ Similar sentiments are echoed in: *Woman's Own*, 22 Oct. 1932, p. 51, 77; and *Woman's Own*, 18 Aug 1934, p. 565. A more balanced view is presented in *Woman's Own*, 11 Mar. 1933, pp. 724-5.

⁴² Martin P. M. Richards and B. Jane Elliott, 'Sex and Marriage in the 1960s and 1970s', in David Clark (ed.), *Marriage, Domestic Life and Social Change: Writings for Jacqueline Burgoyne (1944-1988)* (London and New York, 1991), pp. 36-7. Langhamer, 'Adultery in Post-war England', p. 103.

⁴³ *Modern Marriage*, Jan. 1932.

⁴⁴ *Modern Woman*, Nov. 1930, p. 51.

⁴⁵ *Woman's Own*, 31 Dec. 1932, p. 421.

⁴⁶ *Woman's Own*, 22 Oct. 1932, p. 51.

⁴⁷ *Woman's Own*, 3 Feb. 1934, p. 493.

⁴⁸ *Woman's Own*, 4 Feb. 1933, p. 592.

⁴⁹ *Modern Woman*, Nov. 1930, p. 51.

⁵⁰ Richards and Elliott, 'Sex and Marriage', p. 37; Langhamer, 'Adultery in Post-war England', p. 103.

-
- ⁵¹ *Modern Marriage*, May 1931, p. 96.
- ⁵² *Woman's Own*, 29 Oct. 1932, p. 120.
- ⁵³ 'Snags in Marriage,' p. 565.
- ⁵⁴ *Modern Woman*, Feb. 1929, p. 9.
- ⁵⁵ *Modern Woman*, Nov. 1930, p. 70
- ⁵⁶ *Modern Marriage*, Jun. 1925, p. 72.
- ⁵⁷ *Woman's Own*, 18 Aug. 1934, p. 565
- ⁵⁸ *Woman's Own*, 29 Oct. 1932, p. 120.
- ⁵⁹ *Woman's Own*, 22 Oct. 1932, p. 51. *Modern Marriage*, May 1931, p.96.
- ⁶⁰ *Woman's Own*, 6 Nov. 1937
- ⁶¹ *Woman's Own*, 18 Aug. 1934, p. 565. On distraction see also: *Woman's Own*, 3. Feb. 1934, p. 493; *Modern Woman*, Feb 1929, p. 9; *Modern Woman*, Nov. 1930, p. 70.
- ⁶² *Woman's Own*, 6 Nov. 1937, p. 20. *Woman's Own*, 11 Nov. 1933, p. 133. *Woman's Own*, 18 Aug. 1934, p. 565.
- ⁶³ *Woman's Own*, 22 Oct. 1932, p. 51.
- ⁶⁴ *Modern Woman*, Mar. 1937, p. 76
- ⁶⁵ *Woman's Own*, 1 Feb. 1936, p. 641.
- ⁶⁶ *Woman's Own*, 18 Aug. 1934, p. 565.
- ⁶⁷ *Woman's Own*, 31 Dec. 1932, p. 421.
- ⁶⁸ *Woman's Own*, 1 Feb. 1936, p. 641
- ⁶⁹ John Tosh, *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England* (New Haven, CT and London, 2007) and Langhamer, 'Adultery in Post-War England', pp. 90-1.
- ⁷⁰ *Woman's Own*, 1 Feb. 1936, p. 641.
- ⁷¹ *Woman's Own*, 18 Aug. 1934, p. 565.
- ⁷² *Woman's Own*, 29 Oct. 1932, p. 120.
- ⁷³ On transformations of love across the life-cycle see: Charlotte Greenhalgh, 'Love in Later Life: Old Age, Marriage and Social Research in Mid-Twentieth-Century Britain' in Harris and Jones (eds), *Love and Romance in Britain*.
- ⁷⁴ *Modern Woman*, March 1937, p. 76.
- ⁷⁵ *Modern Woman*, Feb. 1929, p. 9.

⁷⁶ *Woman's Own*, 5 Jan. 1935, p. 449.

⁷⁷ *Woman's Own*, 15 Oct. 1932, p. 28-9.

⁷⁸ *Woman's Own*, 15 Oct. 1932, p. 15.

⁷⁹ *Woman's Own*, 5 Jan. 1935, p. 449.

⁸⁰ *Woman's Own*, 29 Oct 1932, p. 120.

⁸¹ *Modern Woman*, Nov. 1926, p. 40.

⁸² Giddens, *The Transformation of Intimacy*.

⁸³ *Woman's Own*, 20 Apr. 1935, p. 57.

⁸⁴ Light, *Forever England*, p. 11.

⁸⁵ See, for example, Hansard HC Debate, 8 Jun. 1923, vol. 165, Col. 2649.